Notice of Adjournment Motion *re* : the Hubli incident

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I have given notice of an adjournment motion, pertaining to the Hubli incident, two hours before the sitting of the House according to the rules. I may be given consent to move it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall look into it.

Notice of a question of privilege against the Deputy Minister for Health

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I have sent notice of a privilege motion against the Hon. Deputy Minister for Health on the ground that he has given a false, misleading and untruthful statement on the floor of the House. So I may be given consent to raise that matter on the floor of the House. I may state the facts very briefly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I know the facts.

†Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I shall state it very briefly. On 17th January 1969 when a question was put whether the Director of Health Services does not go on tour the Hon. Deputy Minister for Health said that he does not go on tour and there is no definite rule that he has to undertake tour and that if there is any urgent need he will undertake a tour. This was the answer that he gave. Later on, this matter was again brought to the notice of the Minister for Health. I refer to the question put by the Speaker himself to the Hon. Deputy Minister on 20th January 1968, "Is that what you stated is correct?" To that the Hon. Deputy Minister said: "Yes, it is correct." There is also a statement made by the Hon. Minister for Health Sri Y. Ramakrishna that there is a Government order on the basis of which the Director of Health Services has to undertake tour for 10 days. This means that the Deputy Minister has made a false statement, a misleading and untruthful statement. He has misled the House by saying that there are no circulars that the Director of Health Services has to undertake tour for 10 days.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The matter is fresh in the minds of hon. Members.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—There is the case of Stelvia when she wrote a letter to Dr. Lohia that a certain Central Minister whom she met had given an assurance in writing. When the concerned Minister said that he had not given any such assurance, the letter was produced and it was proved that there was a contradictory and untrue statement by the Minister and on that account consent was given for moving the privilage motion on the ground of making a contradiatory and untrue statement.

Similarly, Sir, you know the case of Profumo in which also there was a contradictory statement by the Minister. On the strength of